

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed March 26, 2007 has been given careful consideration by the applicants. Recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 4, 6-9 and 15 is noted with appreciation. However, reconsideration and reexamination of the application is hereby respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 11-15 remain in the application. Claims 6, 8 and 10 have been canceled.

The Office Action

The Examiner objected to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to claims 6-9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,882,498 to Cochran et al.

The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 4, 6-9 and 15 were allowable but objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Non-Art Matters

The Examiner objected to the drawings. However, it is submitted that one of skill in the art would understand the features, as claimed, in view of the drawings. For example, claim 1 recites, in part, a patterned illuminator configured to provide spatially-adjacent regions of uniform, diffuse lighting and lighting voids. This feature is apparent in Figure 3 (e.g. areas 91 and voids 92). Front lit diffusers are also clearly supported by the description (e.g. paragraph 15) and the drawings (which, for simplicity, show representations of the light sources 90 and 110). The "second location" and the "inverse engineered illumination pattern" are recited in the method claims and the corresponding steps are shown in Figure 5 (and described in the associated text in paragraphs 39, 47 and 48). These features should also be clear to those skilled in the art from a review of Figures 3 and 6 (and associated text). As such, the objections of the Examiner should be reconsidered.

The Examiner objected to claims 6-9, 11 and 13 for various informalities. In response, claims 7, 9, 11 and 13 were previously amended to address the Examiner's

concerns. As to claim 6, it has been canceled. Reconsideration is, therefore, requested.

The Claims Distinguish Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cochran '498. However, as previously argued, it is respectfully submitted that Cochran '498 does not include a patterned illuminator as described and claimed in the present application. The Examiner indicates that element 10 in Cochran '498 is a patterned illuminator. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner does not establish that the element 10 provides spatially adjacent regions of uniform, diffuse lighting and lighting voids to produce engineered illumination fields. The element 10 is described in connection with a diffuser plate 16. Nonetheless, this arrangement should not be fairly read to be the patterned illuminator contemplated and claimed by the present invention.

The Examiner asserts that Cochran '498 shows a pattern of LEDs and a diffuser which can create lighting and lighting voids. However, Cochran '498 does not disclose a patterned illuminator as disclosed and claimed herein, e.g., having areas 91 and voids 92, as in Figure 3 and recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 14 are submitted to be distinguishable from Cochran '498. Likewise, all claims dependent thereon are submitted to be distinguishable.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 11-15) are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

Sept 14, 2007
Date


Joseph D. Dreher, Reg. No. 37,123
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.

Roseanne Giuliani
Roseanne Giuliani

Date: September 14, 2007